SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS	DEFENDANTS	
ANGELA HOOVER		MONARCH RECOVERY MANAGEMENT, INC.		
				,
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff		County of Residence o	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant	
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	me, Address, Telephone Number and Email Add	ress)	O CONDEMNATION CASES, US	TE THE LOCATION OF THE
Craig Thor Kimmel, E	squire		NVOLVED.	SE THE LOCATION OF THE
Kimmel & Silverman,		Attornove (If Vnoum)		
30 E. Butler Pike		Attorneys (If Known)		
Ambler, PA 19002				
(215) 540-8888 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff				
☐ 1 U.S. Government	☑ 3 Federal Question	(For Diversity Cases Only)	TF DEF	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen of This State	1 🗇 1 Incorporated or Pr	incipal Place 🗇 4 🗇 4
			of Business In Thi	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity	Citizen of Another State	2	
	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen or Subject of a	3	6 6
		Foreign Country	3 D 3 Toleign Wation	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUR		☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State Reapportionment
☐ 120 Marine	310 Airplane 362 Personal Injury		423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractic Liability ☐ 365 Personal Injury -	of Property 21 USC 881		☐ 450 Commerce
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment			PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights	460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and
☐ 151 Medicare Act	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product	650 Airline Regs.	☐ 830 Patent	Corrupt Organizations
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability Liability 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPER	TY G60 Occupational Safety/Health	☐ 840 Trademark	■ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV
(Excl. Veterans)	☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud	☐ 690 Other	COCKA OVERVINANA	☐ 810 Selective Service
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal	LABOR ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff)	■ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage	Act	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	☐ 875 Customer Challenge
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability ☐ 385 Property Damage ☐ 360 Other Personal Product Liability		☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	12 USC 3410 ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
196 Franchise	Injury CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIO	& Disclosure Act NS	865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS	□ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vacat		☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	☐ 893 Environmental Matters
220 Foreclosure	☐ 442 Employment Sentence ☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus:	☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party	☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 895 Freedom of Information
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment☐ 240 Torts to Land	Accommodations	Security Act	26 USC 7609	Act
 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	444 Welfare 535 Death Penalty 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 540 Mandamus & Ott	IMMIGRATION her ☐ 462 Naturalization Application		 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access
250 All Other Real Floperty	Employment	☐ 463 Habeas Corpus -		to Justice
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities - 555 Prison Condition Other	Alien Detainee 465 Other Immigration		☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	440 Other Civil Rights	Actions		
V. ORIGIN (Place	an "X" in One Box Only)			Appeal to District
Transferred from another district (specify) 2 Removed from Proceeding 3 Remanded from Appellate Court 4 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transferred from another district (specify) 6 Multidistrict Litigation 7 Judge from Magistrate Judgment				
		re filing (Do not cite jurisdictions	al statutes unless diversity):	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Brief description of cause: Fair Debt Collection Practices A	ct		
VII. REQUESTED IN		N DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only	if demanded in complaint:
COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: 5 Yes 1 No				
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER				
Explanation:				
7-5-11 /S/ CRAIG THOR KIMMEL				
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD				

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.					
Address of Plaintiff: 900 May Post Office Road, Strashory PD 17579					
Address of Defendant: 10965 Decater Road, Philadelphia PX 19156)					
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:					
(Use Reverse Side For Additional Space)					
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?					
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes□ No□				
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes No C				
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:					
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:				
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:					
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?					
Yes No					
action in this court?					
	Ycs□ No□				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?					
terminated action in this court?	Yes LI No				
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?					
	Yes No No				
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)					
 A. Federal Question Cases: 1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 	 B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 				
2. □ FELA	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury				
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation				
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury				
5. Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury				
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Please				
o. — Labor-Wanagement Relations	specify)				
7. □ Civil Rights	7. □ Products Liability				
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos				
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases				
10 D Social Sagarity Paviery Cases	(Please specify)				
11. All other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S.C \$1692					
(Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION					
(Check Appropriate Category) 1, (YUI 9 THE LIMITED TO COUNSE! of record do hereby certify:					
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of					
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought.					
To a hard hard	57100				
DATE: 15 1\ Attempty at Late	Attorney I.D.#				
Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.# NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.					
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court					
except as noted above.					
7-5-11 (Muse Many James)	57100				
DATE:Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#				

CIV. 609 (6/08)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

SE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM CIVIL ACTION NO. In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned. SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS: (a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. ()(b) Social Security - Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. (c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. (d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. (e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) ()(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.

Telephone

FAX Number

E-Mail Address

(Civ. 660) 10/02

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 FOR THE 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 ANGELA HOOVER, 4 Plaintiff 5 Case No .: v. 6 COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR 7 MONARCH RECOVERY MANAGEMENT,) INC., JURY TRIAL 8 Defendant (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 9 10 **COMPLAINT** 11 ANGELA HOOVER ("Plaintiff"), by her attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., 12 alleges the following against MONARCH RECOVERY MANAGEMENT, INC. ("Defendant"): 13 14 INTRODUCTION 15 Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 1. 16 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"), which prohibits debt collectors from engaging in abusive, 17 deceptive, and unfair practices and the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et 18 seq. ("TCPA"). 19 20 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 21 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states 22 that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court 23 24 without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original 25 jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.

- 3. Defendant conducts business and has its main office in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.
 - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).
 - 5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Strasburg, Pennsylvania, 17579.
- 7. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 8. Defendant is a debt collection company with its principal place of business located at 10965 Decatur Road, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19154.
- 9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

11. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and

misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.

- 12. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.
- 13. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 14. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt

collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 15. At all relevant times, Defendant was attempting to collect an alleged consumer debt from Plaintiff.
- 16. The alleged debt at issue arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 17. Beginning in or before June 2010, Defendant constantly and continuously contacted Plaintiff on her home telephone seeking and demanding payment for a consumer debt.
- 18. Plaintiff received telephone calls and voice messages from Defendant on a number of occasions from the following telephone number: (800) 503-3852, which the undersigned confirmed is a phone number for Defendant.
- 19. Defendant contacted Plaintiff several times a week, causing her to receive, on average, more than ten (10) collection calls a week.
- 20. For example, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on Monday, May 24, 2010, at 8:15 a.m.; on Wednesday, May 26, 2010, at 9:25 a.m.; and Friday, May 28, 2010, at 8:24 a.m.
- 21. In addition to continuously and repeatedly contacting Plaintiff, Defendant left automated, pre-corded, voicemail messages on her home answering machine, which were able to be heard by other people in her family, including her minor children.
- 22. For example, on June 8, 2010, at 8:23 a.m., Defendant contacted Plaintiff on her home telephone and left the following pre-recorded, voicemail message:

Message from 1-800-503-3852 at 8:23 a.m. June 8th. This is a message for Angela Hoover. If this is not you, please hang-up or

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

13

14

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

disconnect. By continuing to listen to this message you acknowledge you are Angela Hoover.

This is Monarch Recovery Management. This communication is from a debt collector. This is an attempt to collect a debt and any information obtained will be used for that purpose. Please contact me about this matter at 888-220-2577 and refer to file number 98500370. Thank you.

See Exhibit A, June 8, 2010, voicemail message from Defendant.

- Defendant continued to contact Plaintiff, leaving the same pre-recorded, 23. voicemail message on Plaintiff's voicemail. Plaintiff saved some of those voicemail messages, specifically the ones that she received from Defendant on: July 5, 2010; July 11, 2010; and July 13, 2010.
- On July 6, 2010, at 9:26 a.m., Defendant called Plaintiff on her home telephone 24. and left the following pre-recorded, voicemail message:

Third message from 1-800-503-3852 at 9:26 a.m. July 6th. This is a message for Angela Hoover. If this is not you please hang-up or By continuing to listen to this message you disconnect. acknowledge you are Angela Hoover.

This is Monarch Recovery Management. This communication is from a debt collector. This is an attempt to collect a debt and any information obtained will be used for that purpose. Please contact me about this matter at 888-220-2577 and refer to file number 98500370. Thank you.

See Exhibit B, July 6, 2010, voicemail message from Defendant.

25. Also, on July 11, 2010, at 12:20 p.m., Defendant again called Plaintiff on her home telephone and left the following pre-recorded, voicemail message:

> Sixth message from 1-800-503-3852 at 12:20 p.m., July 11th. This is a message for Angela Hoover. If this is not you please hang-up or disconnect. By continuing to listen to this message you acknowledge you are Angela Hoover.

> This is Monarch Recovery Management. This communication is

from a debt collector. This is an attempt to collect a debt and any information obtained will be used for that purpose. Please contact me about this matter at 888-220-2577 and refer to file number 98500370. Thank you.

See Exhibit C, July 11, 2010, voicemail message from Defendant.

26. Thereafter, on July 13, 2010, at 8:57 a.m., Defendant called Plaintiff on her home telephone and left the following pre-recorded, voicemail message:

Eighth message from 1-800-503-3852 at 8:57 a.m., July 13th. This is a message for Angela Hoover. If this is not you please hang-up or disconnect. By continuing to listen to this message you acknowledge you are Angela Hoover.

This is Monarch Recovery Management. This communication is from a debt collector. This is an attempt to collect a debt and any information obtained will be used for that purpose. Please contact me about this matter at 888-220-2577 and refer to file number 98500370. Thank you.

See Exhibit D, July 13, 2010, voicemail message from Defendant.

27. Most recently, on August 3, 2010, Defendant called Plaintiff on her home telephone and left the following pre-recorded, voicemail message stating:

Eleventh message from 1-800-503-3852 yesterday at 8:13 a.m. This is a message for Angela Hoover. If this is not you please hang-up or disconnect. By continuing to listen to this message you acknowledge you are Angela Hoover.

This is Monarch Recovery Management. This communication is from a debt collector. This is an attempt to collect a debt and any information obtained will be used for that purpose. Please contact me about this matter at 888-220-2577 and refer to file number 98500370. Thank you.

See Exhibit E, voicemail message from Defendant.

- 28. When contacting Plaintiff on her telephone, upon information and belief, Defendant used an automated telephone dialing system or pre-recorded or artificial voice.
 - 29. Plaintiff did not expressly consent to Defendant's placement of telephone calls to

her telephone by the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or pre-recorded or artificial voice prior to Defendant's placement of the calls.

- 30. None of Defendant's telephone calls placed to Plaintiff were for "emergency purposes," as specified in 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)(A).
- 31. Plaintiff never expressly consented to the placement of calls to her home telephone by the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or pre-recorded or artificial voice from the original creditor of the account that Defendant was seeking to collect.
- 32. Despite knowing that it did not have her prior express consent, Defendant willfully and knowingly placed automated telephone calls to Plaintiff's home telephone and left pre-recorded or automated messages.
- 33. Finally, in those instances where Plaintiff spoke with Defendant, Defendant asked questions about her marital status, the number of dependants she had, and other personal information, which Plaintiff believed Defendant was seeking this information solely to harass her as the personal information it was seeking did not have any relation to the alleged debt which Defendant was seeking to collect.
- 34. Defendant's actions in attempting to collect the alleged debt were harassing, abusive and highly deceptive.

CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

35. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v.</u>

Equifax A.R.S., 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp., 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); Clomon v. Jackson, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).

- 36. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).
- 37. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1991

- 38. In 1991, Congress enacted the TCPA, in response to a growing number of consumer complaints regarding certain telemarketing practices.
- 39. The TCPA regulates, among other things, the use of automated telephone equipment, or "autodialers." Specifically, the plain language of section 227(b)(1)(B) prohibits the use of autodialers to make any call to a residential telephone line in the absence of an emergency or the prior express consent of the called party.
- 40. According to findings by the Federal Communication Commission ("FCC"), the agency Congress vested with authority to issue regulations implementing the TCPA, such calls are prohibited because, as Congress found, automated or prerecorded telephone calls are a greater nuisance and invasion of privacy than live solicitation calls, and such calls can be costly and inconvenient.

COUNT I

DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 41. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
 - a. Defendant violated of the FDCPA generally;
 - b. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiff in connection with the collection of an alleged debt;
 - c. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA by causing Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiff;
 - d. Defendant violated §1692e of the FDCPA by using false, deceptive, or

misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of a debt;

- e. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiff to collect or attempt to collect a debt; and
- f. Defendant acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.

COUNT II

DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

- 42. Plaintiff hereby incorporates all facts and allegations specified in all preceding paragraphs, by reference as if fully set forth at length.
- 43. The Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), codified at 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., prohibits the initiation of any telephone call to any residential telephone line using an artificial or prerecorded voice to deliver a message without the prior express consent of the called party. See 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B).
- 44. A person may bring a private cause of action "based on a violation of this subsection or the regulations prescribed under this subsection to enjoin such violation" under \$227(b)(3)(A) of the TCPA.
- 45. A person is entitled to bring "an action to recover for actual monetary loss from such a violation, or to receive \$500 in damages for each such violation, whichever is greater" under §§ 227(b)(3)(B) and 227(c)(5)(B) of the TCPA.
- 46. The Court, in its discretion, is authorized to award up to three (3) times the actual damages sustained for Defendant's violations by §\$227(b)(3) and 227(c)(5) of the TCPA.
- 47. Defendant repeatedly and regularly placed automated calls to Plaintiff's home telephone, leaving several pre-recorded or automated messages.

- 48. Neither Defendant nor the original creditor had Plaintiff's prior express consent to place these automated telephone calls to her home telephone.
- 49. Despite knowing that it did not have her prior express consent, Defendant willfully and knowingly placed automated telephone calls to Plaintiff's home telephone and left pre-recorded or automated messages.
- 50. Defendant's conduct violated § 227(b)(1)(B) of the TCPA by making any call using any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial prerecorded voice to Plaintiff's residential telephone.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, ANGELA HOOVER, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual compensatory damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3);
- d. Statutory damages of \$500 for each violation of the TCPA, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(B); and
- e. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

DATED: 7-5-11

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, ANGELA HOOVER, demands a jury trial in this case.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

By: CTK 3654

Craig Thor Kimmel
Attorney ID # 57100
Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com

EXHIBITS "A-E" ARE AUDIO FILES CONTIAINING VOICE MAILS.

A SEPARATE CD CONTAINING EXHIBITS "A-E" WAS FILED CONTEMPERANOUSLY WITH THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT ON JULY 5, 2011